		1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2		
3		X
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	: 19-CR-576(BMC)
5	Plaintiff,	: United States Courthouse
6	-against-	: Brooklyn, New York
7	GENARO GARCIA LUNA,	: March 31, 2020
8	Defendant.	: 10:30 o'clock a.m.
9		X
10	TRANSCRIPT OF BAIL APPLICATION VIA TELECONFERENCE	
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE RAMON E. REYES UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE.	
12		
13	APPEARANCES:	
14	For the Government:	RICHARD P. DONOGHUE
15		United States Attorney BY: RYAN C. HARRIS
16		MICHAEL P. ROBOTTI ERIN REID
17		Assistant United States Attorneys 271 Cadman Plaza East
18		Brooklyn, New York
19	For the Defendant:	CESAR DE CASTRO, ESQ.
20		VALERIE A. GOTLIB, ESQ.
21		,
22	Court Reporter:	Charleane M. Heading 225 Cadman Plaza East
23		Brooklyn, New York (718) 613-2643
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript	
25	produced by computer-aided transcription.	

```
2
               (All present via teleconference.)
1
 2
               (Defendant not present.)
                          This is a criminal cause for bail
 3
              THE CLERK:
 4
    application, USA versus Genaro Garcia Luna. The case number
    is 19-CR-576.
5
              Counsel, state your names for the record starting
6
7
    with the government.
8
              MR. HARRIS: Ryan Harris for the United States.
9
    Good morning, Your Honor. With me are Michael Robotti and
    Erin Reid also for the United States.
10
11
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
12
              For the defendant?
13
              MR. DE CASTRO: Good morning, Your Honor. Cesar
14
    De Castro and Valeria Gotlib for Mr. Garcia Luna.
15
              THE COURT: Good morning.
16
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Harris?
18
              MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: Why don't you summarize the government's
20
    position with respect to bail for Mr. Garcia Luna.
21
              MR. HARRIS: Sure, Your Honor.
22
              So as an initial matter, it's our view that the risk
    that this defendant will flee if he is released under any
23
    conditions are unacceptably high.
24
25
              The first question I think for the Court to consider
```

is does this defendant have a motive to flee. Absolutely, he does. Charged with multiple drug trafficking conspiracy charges, they all involve the most powerful and violent drug trafficker --

THE COURT: Right. One moment, Mr. Harris.

If you are not government counsel or defense counsel, you must mute your lines. Thank you.

Continue, Mr. Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you.

He faces a minimum of 10 years in prison, that's the guidelines range, to life. That potential life sentence is an incredibly strong incentive to flee and the evidence of his guilt here is damming in the government's view. It includes testimony from numerous witnesses including multiple firsthand witnesses who personally bribed the defendant, drug seizures and financial records. And so question for the court is does the defendant have a motive to flee the United States. The answer unequivocally is yes.

The second question for the Court is does he have the means to flee and, again, the answer is absolutely he does. First, he has extremely strong ties to a foreign country: Mexico. He was born in Mexico. He was raised in Mexico. He is a citizen of Mexico. He lived there his entire life until 2012. He has extended family in Mexico. He traveled there more than 30 times in the last five years.

4 In addition, crossing the border to Mexico for a 1 2 Mexican citizen is not challenging. He can cross by car, by 3 foot without even showing official documents. At least that's 4 our understanding. 5 In Mexico, he would not just have the support of 6 He would have the support of former -family. 7 (Inaudible.) 8 THE COURT: Mr. Harris, just a second. 9 Sui-May, do me a favor. E-mail me the host 10 password. Not the access code but the host password. 11 MR. HARRIS: I was saying he can cross by car or on 12 foot without even needing to show any official documents. 13 least that's the government's understanding. 14 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Harris. MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: One second, Mr. Harris. Bear with me. 16 17 (Pause.) 18 THE CLERK: Do you need me to do something, Judge? 19 THE COURT: What I did is I pulled up all of the 20 people who are calling in and I've muted who doesn't have it 21 on mute. 22 I just want to be clear. If you are not muted and I 23 hear you and you are not defense counsel or government 24 counsel, you are going to get muted and you may get kicked off 25 the call. This is a public proceeding but we have to operate

like we were in court. Anyone in the gallery has to shut up.

So if you have it on speaker and not mute, we're going to hear
you and you are going to get kicked out.

Sorry, Mr. Harris. You can continue.

MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

So what I was just saying or discussing was the ease with which he could cross into Mexico.

Now, once he arrives in Mexico, this defendant would not have the support of his extended family. He would have the support of a web of corrupt former Mexican officials and members of the Sinaloa cartel which are the two most powerful institutions in Mexico. This is a web he has built over decades during his time in Mexico and this web of a combination of corrupt former officials and Sinaloa cartel members has helped other individuals, powerful individuals escape capture of prosecution for years. Chapo Guzman has evaded capture for 15 years. Gabriel Cantero is currently at large and has been evading capture for seven years. This web can assist him in doing the same and it would be powerfully motivated to ensure that he never returns to an American courtroom where the full details of his crimes would be unveiled.

So he has the strong motive to flee and the means he needs to do so and these risks, in the government's view, are unacceptably high. That's why we believe there are no

accommodations or conditions that will ensure his continued appearance service.

Pretrial Services has reached this same conclusion twice, both when he was originally arraigned in the Western District of Texas and as recently as February 27th in connection with the last bond application, Pretrial Service reached the same conclusion. This is obviously also a case where there is a fact driven presumption that the defendant should be detained due to the nature of the crimes he's charged with and we believe the facts here just echo the presumption and that conclusion. So the government feels that a permanent order is necessary.

We also have, as outlined in our brief, significant concerns and believe there are substantial defects in the bond application that's being proposed here.

Now, as an initial matter, the defendant presents this as a \$2 million bond but, Your Honor, in reality, it's more of an \$800,000 bond. That's because he's proposing to secure the bond with a real estate property worth \$1.2 million. That property the government is already going to seek to forfeit at the conclusion of this criminal prosecution and so he knows he's going to lose it if he's convicted. It provides no incentive for him to stay and that's precisely what courts would have to apply in the 3142, subsection (g)(4), statute that includes that properties that

are subject to forfeiture may not be appropriate collateral for a bond proceeding.

So he knows that he's going to lose this property whether he's convicted or whether he flees. There's nothing to deter him from fleeing to preserve this property, but what the property being posted does do is it significantly reduces the financial exposure of the suretors here. So they, in effect, only have \$800,000 worth of exposure, not \$2 million worth of exposure.

More so, Your Honor, because the value of the properties proposed to be posted by two of the suretors, Carlos and Maria Villar, exceed \$800,000, the remaining suretors have no financial exposure under this proposed bond because it's going to be satisfied by those properties. So although it's presented as a \$2 million ten suretor bond package, in reality, Your Honor, it's more of an \$800,000 two -suretor bond package.

Now, those two suretors, Carlos and Maria Villar, in our view, cannot exercise the necessary moral suasion to ensure that the defendant returns to court.

I saw in the defendant's latest filing last night that Mr. Villar now represents that he saw the defendant a year ago in January 2019. I would note that we interviewed Mr. Villar twice this past week and in connection with the February 27th bond proceeding and both times, he had said that

he had not seen the defendant in two years which is just not consistent with what he's saying. His wife gave the same number, that she had not seen him in about two years. And in addition, both of them separately said that they had only seen the defendant about ten times since 2012 so that's about once a year.

Now, under the way this bond is structured, these are the only two people that are going to have real financial exposure here and these two people who live hundreds of miles away from him with no ability to monitor firsthand, they're not going to be able to see him every day, every week, every month, and they already have not seen him more than a year or possibly two years depending on which version of the facts you believe based on Mr. Villar's representation to the various parties. You can count the number of times he's seen them in the past eight years on two hands. It's not a lot. This is not the type of close relationship, somebody who lives in the community with him that can monitor him.

Now, given the seriousness of the charges here, the defendant's strong incentive to flee, the significant ties to a foreign country with a close border and, in fact, if he were to return to Mexico, it's obvious these two suretors don't provide the sufficient assurance that he's going to return to the court and they cannot exercise the sufficient supervision and moral situation.

Now, the remaining eight suretors, because of this property being posted, they have no financial exposure under the proposed bond. It's going to be fully satisfied by Mr. Villar's property and the defendant's already forfeitable property.

Now, the government has endeavored to interview each of those witnesses and, frankly, Your Honor, it's raised additional concerns putting aside what I've just said. Two of the remaining suretors, Cesar Giraldo and Andres Merro, are former employees of the defendant. Carla Perez was also a former employee of the defendant and apparently she's no longer willing to sign the bond.

Just with respect to Ms. Perez, Your Honor, we want to correct the record. In the defendant's last filing yesterday, there was a reference or an insinuation that Ms. Perez had been pressured not to sign the bond because it had been communicated to her that it would jeopardize her son's citizenship application.

As far as the government is aware, that is out of our control. I personally spoke to Ms. Perez. I never brought up the son's citizenship application. It never came up at all in any of our interviews with her. In fact, Your Honor, I didn't even know she had a son, let alone a citizenship application was pending until I saw the file last night. So any impression that the government pressured her

not to sign the bond is categorically false.

The remaining two suretors that I mentioned, Cesar Giraldo and Andres Merro, as I said, they're former employees of the defendant. They depended on the defendant for their financial livelihood for years. They called the defendant and his wife their boss.

We spoke to Cesar Giraldo specifically this morning, Your Honor. He told us that for the last several years, he's derived 90 percent of his income from the defendant. The relationship with a boss to an employee with Cesar Giraldo being the employee. He said it was not a social relationship. It was a strictly business relationship. It is not the type of relationship where he can exercise moral suasion or authority over him to ensure that he returns to court.

Moreover, it's not clear that Cesar Giraldo has any current source of income now that the defendant has been arrested and he depended on him until he was arrested in December for 90 percent of his income. I tried to get a better sense of his finances when we spoke and I asked him how much money he was making now and he would not give me a figure. He just said not much, not much at all, so it's not even clear he has any income to help satisfy the bond.

In the defense's submission, they represented that Mr. Giraldo was willing to secure the bond with his house which they represented was worth \$489,000 and he had \$175,000

in equity. Now, when I spoke with Mr. Giraldo this morning, it raised significant questions about that representation. What he told me, Your Honor, was that he bought this house in 2015 for a little north of \$300,000. His down payment was only \$11,000. He told me that he still owes \$313,000 on that mortgage meaning he has not acquired substantial more equity in the home due to payments on his mortgage.

So when the defense said that he has \$175,000 equity in a home valued at \$489,000, there's not a real basis for that. There was no appraisal of this house done. There was no assessment of his house done. It was essentially based on their view that this house is now worth \$489,000 or almost \$200,000 more than when he purchased it five years ago. It's kind of pulling a number out of a hat. He's not put down \$175,000 in a down payment or otherwise invested in the property. It's purely based on their assessment of the market and not backed by any documentation as far as the government is aware.

The second suretor that Your Honor we reference is Andres Merro, also an employee of the defendant, and we tried to speak with him numerous times in connection with this bond application. He has not returned our call. We've called and left voicemails numerous times. We haven't been able to confirm whether he's willing to sign the bond, whether he's willing to secure his residence or how much equity value he

actually has in the residence or whether it's based on this kind of assessment of the current market value of his home or not.

When we did interview Mr. Merro a month ago in connection with the prior bond application, he advised the government that he had not seen the defendant in two years and he had only met him approximately ten times. So, again, Your Honor, this is not the kind of relationship where he has the necessary moral suasion over the defendant, the kind of social relationship. He is someone who reported to the defendant and his wife. He's dependent on them for his financial livelihood.

So it's hard to come to any conclusion when you look at these two suretors. Other than that, they are signing, they feel pressured because it's their former employers and because they don't have any real financial exposure under the bond because it's going to be satisfied by other properties posted by Mr. Villar.

So that leaves two remaining financially exposed suretors, Ivan Ramirez and Monica Sarmiento. They have not agreed to post any collateral. In prior applications and in connection with this application, they repeatedly expressed hesitancy about signing the bond that would give them real financial exposure and their willingness to sign on properties being posted that wouldn't satisfy the bond. I believe that

their current willingness to sign the bond is at least predicated on the understanding that because this \$1.2 million forfeited property being posted by the defendant and there's another property by Mr. Villar, they don't really have financial exposure.

So, Your Honor, I think that what you're really looking at here is an \$800,000 bond signed by two suretors who are hundreds of miles away and don't have the kind of relationship to exercise moral suasion over him. As I mentioned to you earlier, there is no combination of conditions that would secure his release, but certainly this package raises significant questions about the true value of the properties, the current income of the suretors and whether they actually have any financial exposure and are going to be sufficiently motivated to have skin in the game in order to, in order to ensure the defendant returns to court.

Now, there's a separate application, Your Honor, in connection with whether he should be temporarily released for purposes of COVID-19 which I'm happy to address now or if we'd like to focus on this application as an initial matter and then we can turn to COVID-19, I'm also happy to do that.

THE COURT: Let's take them one at a time.

Mr. De Castro, do you want to respond?

MR. DE CASTRO: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

Well, I guess let me start with the following. So

it seems in the government's view that you cannot be friends with the defendant, you cannot be his family, you cannot be his current business associate or former business associate. So I really don't know who in the government's view could ever sign a bond to then qualify as, you know, what they're saying is an appropriate moral suasion witness.

First -- I mean, second, with respect to Ms. Perez, our application does not say that the government said anything about his immigration, her son's immigration applications. What was communicated by Ms. Perez to my client's family was that her counsel had informed her that signing on the bond could jeopardize that application in some sort of way, I guess, given the high profile nature of the case. So we've withdrawn her at her request as a potential cosigner. And as we made clear in our reply last night, that removed -- she has, I think she reports about \$19,000 in salary and she was not putting up a property.

So all the co-signers in this case collectively -the government likes to focus upon each individual person and
they do not want to focus on this package as a whole and the
reason they don't want to do that is because it's a very
strong package which, as a whole, people with moral suasion,
people with financial responsibility, property.

What the government just gave you in a very lengthy sort of summary was that, okay, now they're still not enough

skin in the game for the cosigners. We're dammed if we do. We're dammed if we don't. If we put up properties of the co-signers, now they're saying there's not enough, they don't have enough skin in the, game so a \$2 million bond is not appropriate. Fine, increase the bond to 3 million, but then when we don't have both properties, they say that the co-signers have no skin in the game. So I don't really know what to do there.

We decided to do a combination where we're putting up the defendant's property which is valued we believe around \$1.2 million, and that property, as I said in the prior bail applications and I know the Court read the transcripts, I'm sure, the government talks as if they won a forfeiture on traceable assets here. Number one, these aren't assets they have listed in an indictment as frozen or forfeitable. These are substitute assets that they're talking about. They have to win a trial and then they have to actually succeed in a forfeiture proceeding.

So I think it's a little bit presumptuous to say that these are properties that are, will be forfeited in our multi-million dollar judgment that we haven't obtained yet.

The issue of Mr. Villar, Carlos Villar is a former FBI agent that worked with Mr. Garcia Luna years ago. They remain close friends. I've been in contact with him throughout this process. He's very concerned about his friend

and former, I guess, colleague. They didn't work for the same organization but they were colleagues. And the version -- I don't know, I don't know what notes the government has, but any time I've spoken with Mr. Villar, you know, he's expressed a real concern with Mr. Garcia Luna and I think he expressed that in the e-mail that we attach to our reply.

The government has this issue with where he is, that he's in Utah. Okay. Well, you know, we're in 2020. We are all sitting -- there are 16 people participating in a telephone conference for a bail proceeding. I talked to my family via Zoom because we're all in, you know, we're all hunkering down. I'm still very close with my family. I'm still very close with people I speak on the telephone that I see on occasion because people are traveling or working or decided to retire in different places. I think that's just a red herring and they're just coming up with some excuse or reason to try to disqualify someone who is an extraordinarily strong suretor.

With respect to -- I mean, I think we put our positions very clear on the record. I don't -- every defendant who is charged in a federal case has a, quote, unquote, or is a flight risk in some sort of way, has a motive to flee, as the government puts it. This defendant is not fleeing. He's not going anywhere. All these people have, will have skin in the game. His community in Florida, his

business community, his former colleagues, all these people will be at risk. The thought that he's going to somehow get in the car and drive from Washington, D.C. or if he's living in New York, drive to the border and, you know, somehow walk across the border or be in a car or something like that and then make his way is --

(Inaudible interruption.)

THE COURT: Hold on. Muted.

Go ahead, Mr. De Castro.

MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you, Judge.

And this web that the government continues to allude to, no one's asking them to disclose targets, but they can't then say with just this crowd, there's this web of people. No one knows -- we only know who it is who are going to help him, this web of people that are going to help him financially and somehow physically get him to safety somewhere. That web of people, have they hired counsel for him? No. Does the government talk about all the money Mr. Garcia Luna has in his account? No. He has no money. He has no ability to do this and no one is coming to his, quote, unquote, "rescue."

Meanwhile, he's sitting in the MDC in a unit that is directly next to the unit where they are allegedly quarantining inmates and, which we can talk about later, does have a higher risk for contracting COVID-19. He is not a flight risk here. I think Judge Levy was clear and I think

right to say that this is a bailable case. He said what do we need. We need some people with more skin in the game. Fine. So we did that. People are willing to come to his aid and they are.

With respect to this issue of property value, so I've been doing this for a little while. I've been a prosecutor and now I've been a defense lawyer for over a decade in the federal court and I think when we have an appraisal available, we try to get them. It's difficult when the entire country has been on lockdown and has been preparing for this since January. We are basing the market value on the people, the individuals who say, I think my house is worth this amount, and then just looking around at sort of listings to get a sense for the market.

So I think that, in the government's submission, I think there's something about how the potential suretors have only paid, paid interest. Well, welcome to the banking world. I wish I was JPMorgan Chase or some other bank because for the first 10 years, you pretty much only pay interest and that's why it's a 30 year mortgage, but I think this is his community. These are his friends, this is his family, that are willing to sign on this bond and put themselves at risk. I think it is very telling that someone who's a waiter, a waitress, a manager in a restaurant, is willing to do this because of their connection to the family. Right? Because

Mr. Garcia Luna, it's not just him, it's his wife, his two children, all three of them.

Mr. Garcia Luna is a lawful permanent resident of the United States. His wife and two children are United States citizens. They moved here in 2012. His kids are in college. They are remotely learning right now. They are all living together and they, they are all trying to -- and they're renting an apartment.

So I think this is a very strong bail package. I don't know what else the government would want. What they have said to you Your Honor is, well, the suretors don't have enough in the game. Okay. So the bond should be 3 million then according to them. Then that's it. Fine.

Then I'll address COVID, I guess, after the government. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm just looking at the surety report that was given to Judge Levy.

Mr. De Castro, does his wife, Ms. Flores Alvarez, and his son and daughter, do they all have passports?

MR. DE CASTRO: Yes, and they are all, and they're all willing to provide them to the Court.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, just to address that point -- I know you're reviewing documents. I'm happy to wait. I just wanted to reiterate that, you know, it's our understanding that an American citizen can cross into Mexico

without a passport, without official documents, by vehicle or by car. So I don't think that turning in passports provides any kind of deterrent or assurance that they're not going to cross.

I'm happy to address some of the other points but if Your Honor is focused on that, I'm happy to focus where Your Honor would like clarity.

MR. DE CASTRO: If I may, on that point of the crossing, I mean we're proposing location monitoring and, you know, sometimes -- you know, the government in a violation of supervised release, for example, will say how amazing location monitoring is and how, how we can pinpoint that this defendant left here and violated supervised release, but then in a proceeding like this, they want to say location monitoring is not sufficient. I don't understand. There's a notification immediately if someone leaves a particular area that is designated and, you know, I've experienced it all over the district and --

THE COURT: I assume Mr. Harris is referring to his family and not Mr. Garcia Luna in that last comment.

MR. HARRIS: It's both, Your Honor, and the question is not, I think, the ability of location monitoring to determine if the defendant has left the district. It's the ability of if, to do so and the appropriate resources to be mobilized in extremely short order in light of a pandemic and

21 government overload, where this defendant only needs a few 1 2 hours to get in the car and drive straight to the border and the question will be if that's a sufficient amount of time for 3 4 the appropriate notifications to be made and once they have 5 been made, he can be stopped. THE COURT: A few hours from Washington, D.C. to get 6 7 to Mexico or to Canada even? 8 MR. HARRIS: I certainly think it can be done in 9 less than a day, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And the borders are closed. MR. HARRIS: Well, Your Honor, I think we all well 11 12 know that border is a porous border and it is not one that, 13 you know, if the official border crossing is closed, that 14 forebodes people from crossing the border. 15 THE COURT: Hold on just one second. It's a pretty good trek from DC to Mexico, to the 16 17 It's at least a day. It's 1,800 miles. border. 18 MR. DE CASTRO: Judge, Google Maps tells me that it would be one day and one hour by car to Laredo, Texas, 19 1,722 miles. 20 21 MR. HARRIS: Well, Your Honor, if he cuts off his ankle bracelet and flees, it's going to be very difficult to 22 23 locate him within one day and one hour, especially given the 24 current state of the country. That's all it takes.

CMH OCR RMR CRR FCRR

MR. DE CASTRO: Not to belabor this point, but I

25

think it would be easier to find someone when you have the entire resources of the federal government agencies and the fact that most people are inside their homes.

THE COURT: Didn't this just happen yesterday or the day before where it was someone that Judge Orenstein released and within an hour, he cut off his anklet and they got him?

MR. HARRIS: So, Your Honor, I don't know the specifics of the case. I do know that he cut off his ankle monitor. I don't know whether he remained in his home. I don't know whether he remained in his community. I certainly do not have any reason to believe that he cut off his ankle bracelet and started driving to the border.

THE COURT: If you cut it off, it triggers.

MR. LONG: Your Honor, this is Robert Long with Pretrial. I can speak to that case if necessary.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Long.

MR. LONG: Yes. So that defendant was scheduled to go into drug treatment the next day. He did not flee. We were notified immediately of the bracelet being cut. We were able to -- yes, he picked up the phone, and it just doesn't have any connection to the idea of fleeing the community or risk of flight. There's other noncompliance issues involved in that case.

THE COURT: But if someone cuts their anklet off, notification is immediately sent to Pretrial Services,

correct?

MR. LONG: That's correct. We receive an immediate tamper bracelet alert.

THE COURT: And if they keep it on and just leave the premises, then you get an alert as well, yes?

MR. LONG: Correct. So if the bracelet is on, they leave the house without authorization, we're also notified as well.

MR. HARRIS: So, Your Honor, I do think that case is materially different in that the defendant did not attempt to flee or leave the home.

Pretrial Services may be notified that he has cut it off, but the question is not notification. Again, it's the ability to locate him within short order if he chooses to flee and I don't know that the resources can be mobilized that quickly to locate him in time.

THE COURT: So it's the government's position that this is not just a bailable case at all; is that fair to say?

MR. HARRIS: It is fair to say, Your Honor, and that's because of a number of reasons which I think we discussed earlier. This defendant faces potentially life imprisonment. That's an extremely powerful motivator. He has a place to flee, resources to assist him when he arrives there and every incentive to do so. So it's our view that this is just not a bailable case and, again, Pretrial Services reached

the same conclusion.

THE COURT: I --

MR. DE CASTRO: I'd like to add that Pretrial
Services reached that conclusion without ever talking to any
of the co-signers and that's because when I asked to provide,
when I asked them to provide that information, they didn't
want it and then they were received that information after
Judge Levy required it. And then I spoke to Pretrial Services
that afternoon and I said, What would you like, do you want
telephone numbers, do you want time? They said, Well, we have
this new form. So then they sent me the new form, the suretor
declaration form. I immediately had every single person fill
it out except for Ivan Ramirez and Monica Sarmiento because
they had counsel and that counsel needed to communicate that
to them and they immediately filled them out, sent it back.
They didn't call -- and then we set up times, a window of
times for them to call. They didn't call a single person.

MR. LONG: I'm sorry. Once again, Robert Long, Pretrial Services.

I'm not privy to the exact timeline, but the idea this we didn't speak to people, I'm a little confused. We did surety reports that were submitted to the Court so I'm not quite sure what that means, that we didn't speak to anyone.

MR. DE CASTRO: Pretrial spoke to two people, Monica Sarmiento and Ivan Ramirez in person. Everyone else, they

relied on the suretor declaration form. That's what I was informed of, that they did not need to speak to them. I have e-mails that say it.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, that's because Pretrial Services reached the same conclusion, that there are no combination of conditions of here, just the fact of the nature of the crime charged, potential exposure, defendant's ties to a foreign country that is just next door. If there are no combination of conditions here, then the particulars of the suretors is not, is not relevant because there are no combination of conditions.

MR. DE CASTRO: Well, I sent an e-mail to Judge Levy and he asked them to do the report. They chose not to speak to anyone.

THE COURT: I disagree with Judge Levy so I am going to reject the bail package that is been presented.

I don't believe there are any conditions or combination of conditions that can ensure Mr. Garcia Luna's presence in court when necessary, not to minimize the package that's been offered, but I don't think that it is sufficient. I am not sure that, given the seriousness of the charges that Mr. Garcia Luna faces and the potential should he be found guilty for a significant sentence, that he could resist the urge to flee. I reject the bail package.

That doesn't mean that the temporary release is not

in order so why don't you address that, Mr. Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor.

So the defendant has asked for temporary release under Section 3142(i). He claims that he is in a high risk category for susceptibility to COVID-19. That's just not the case.

In the defendant's own submission, the medical doctor represented that people who are over 60 years old and have a chronic medical condition are in a high risk category. The defendant is not over 60 years old. He does not have a chronic medical indication. They indicate that five years ago, he had some kind of condition that required some sort of treatment and that's the only document of a medical condition. I think there's a reference to some other condition from 2019 but there's no medical documentation for that or anything to kind of provide any kind of substantiation for that, for that claim.

As the Court, I'm sure, is aware, the MDC has compiled an extensive list of all inmates that fall into a high risk category for COVID-19. The defendant is not on that list.

Now, the government, of course, takes the threats of COVID-19 extremely seriously. We are in daily contact with the MDC and the BOP. As of right now, my understanding is there's only one inmate at MDC who had a confirmed case of

COVID-19. That inmate is isolated. That defendant has access to hot water and soap and that's without video contact to confirm that's the defendant's particular situation. The BOP has issued a number of procedures to ensure the health and the safety of the inmates including requiring inmates to self seclude.

We think this inmate does not have, fall into a high risk category. There's no medical documentation to support that. We do take this seriously and the MDC is taking extra precautions to ensure the safety of the defendants. The U.S. Attorney's Office is not opposing bond petitions categorically with respect to all inmates. We are doing it on a case by case basis and, as appropriate, releasing genuine high risk inmates. The defendant is just not one of those inmates. He does not fall into a high risk category and so he should not be granted temporary release.

THE COURT: Mr. De Castro?

MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you, Judge.

So in the government's response to our bail application and I think even today, they are extraordinarily minimizing the danger that COVID-19 poses to the population inside the MDC including Mr. Garcia Luna.

We are today, March 31, 2020, nearing or we have 1,218 deaths in New York City, 250 yesterday alone. The Javitz Center is a hospital. Central Park has a military

style tent hospital. A military ship has arrived and docked in New York City for emergency beds to assist in a crisis.

Mayor de Blasio is essentially begging the United States

Government for more resources every single day and FEMA has started to make makeshift morgues in New York City.

The government's response to our application in this regard is the same as their response has been in almost all of these applications, citing the BOP's action plan. Those action plans are under, which they say they have started in January of 2012, are very, very, very questionable.

THE COURT: I have to cut you off. I have to cut you off Mr. De Castro, because that isn't true.

I've been for the past week dealing with applications for temporary release and the government does not merely fall back on BOP's efforts to make the facility as safe as it can be. Where someone has a medical condition, the government has, if not consented for temporary release, at least not objected. So they do take this seriously. They are responding appropriately. We had a defendant earlier this morning who has a documented health condition that makes him at higher risk for developing complications related to COVID-19.

MR. DE CASTRO: I don't mean to suggest categorically. I mean, in terms of those that they are opposing, they are opposing many, because I know, I'm doing

them, I have also a client who was released from the MDC and so what I'm talking about is that I think the information coming out of the MDC and -- withdrawn.

When the government is opposing an application, what you see is look the BOP's action plan, look at how great the BOP's action plan is.

Number one, yes, the MDC is apparently reporting only one inmate that is positive. This is also a facility that has only has nine, nine, according to Warden Edge, nine kits in order to test people. They have identified 537 inmates as potentially vulnerable but yet, the Federal Defenders, myself, others have asked what is the basis. No one has informed anybody of that basis because I have two clients on that list and I am trying to figure out what the basis is, they won't even tell us and, furthermore, for even those clients that are at high risk, I am now on day six, six awaiting a telephone call with my client.

It is clearly an emergency situation at the BOP. There are not only inmates that we think are positive and are just not symptomatic right now and are probably shedding the virus and infecting others, but there are staff members that are positive. As Representative Velazquez had reported at the end of March, there were 3 staff members that were positive. Since then, two more are positive and, in fact, I believe the Representative is also positive now, too.

So there is, according to the Federal Defender for the Eastern District, Deirdre von Dornum, in her affidavit filed yesterday in a class action for at-risk defendants at the MDC, they have spoken to greater than 100 clients at the MDC, I certainly haven't spoken to that many, I don't have that many in jail, but that there has been very little sanitation changes. Some units have soap. There has been basically a ten minute presentation made to the inmates regarding safety procedures and COVID. The staff and the units are -- some are wearing masks. Some are not wearing protective gear. It's up to them individually.

And that -- sorry, Judge. One second.

I think that the wave is coming as is the wave at -I hope it's not and I hope they are putting in procedures, but
what I'm seeing is that the wave is probably coming which is
the wave that is happening at the New York City jails right
now where it is running rampant.

Judge Engelmayer in the Southern District of

New York yesterday issued an opinion in a case which is <u>United</u>

<u>States versus McKenzie</u>. In that, in considering the similar application, McKenzie, he was released on bail pending sentencing. So he was a convicted defendant on a plea on a mandatory remand case for aiding and abetting and assault with a dangerous weapon. He was at the MCC and his high risk was simply that he had asthma and Judge Engelmayer held --

THE COURT: That's not -- that is not such a simple thing. I mean, asthma is a respiratory problem that can be, could prove deadly if someone has COVID-19 and this person who you are pointing to is in a very different situation than your client. He is awaiting sentencing so there's even less incentive for him to flee or to violate the terms of his release than someone with Pretrial. So that's -- it's almost an apples and oranges comparison.

MR. DE CASTRO: Well, Judge, I would submit that it's the opposite. Someone who knows that they're about to serve a significant amount of jail time for being convicted versus someone who is planning on fighting the charges, is presumed innocent and plans on prevailing. There's a big difference there, I would submit.

But I think what I wanted to quote from

Judge Engelmayer, and I agree with you, asthma is very serious but, unfortunately, that's not the position I'm being told by the BOP and in my other clients with asthma, unless it's serious, serious asthma where they take medication on top of an inhaler.

But in that case, Judge Engelmayer, you know, recognized that, quote, "Several courts have already recognized the heightened threat posed by COVID-19 to an inmate with a documented respiratory condition in a detention facility with multiple confirmed cases, that that presents a

unique set of circumstances." He goes on to say and conclude that it's self-evident to the court that Mr. McKenzie is at greater risk of contracting COVID-19 while confined at the MCC and will be safer at home. But I think what's also interesting is that in, in that opinion, Judge Engelmayer, and the government's response is very similar to the government's response here, citing --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I think Judge Engelmayer is wrong. Okay. Someone who has asthma is not at greater risk for contracting COVID-19. Someone who is immunodepressed is. So the problem with asthma and other respiratory problems is not that because of that, you are going to get COVID-19. It's that if you get COVID-19, it's much more devastating because you already have respiratory problems and COVID-19 attacks, leads to pneumonia and other things that cause breathing problems.

And, you know, all of this is besides the point.

Your client doesn't have a health condition, I haven't heard, really that is problematic.

MR. DE CASTRO: His respiratory issue which we're able to get documentation from 2016 but he had a recent attack in 2019, is something that his doctor says potentially was hereditary. His father passed way of a respiratory issue, that, yes, the change in the season and air conditioning and things trigger an attack. What are his symptoms? As

described by him and his family, shortness of breath, high fever exacerbated by the anxiety of having it. He was given naproxen, acetaminophen, ibuprofen, and those are his respiratory issues.

So I think were he to -- I appreciate the judge's comment, yes, I think that that's right, and none of us are at higher risk of getting it, right? Everybody can just get it. That's the scary part of it. It's just spreading to everyone. It's the risk of complications should you contract it which, you know, I submit I think is, it is going to run rampant within the MDC and MCC. I hope I am wrong about that, but what we see happening seems to be to the contrary, so I resubmit that we think his respiratory issue is sufficient enough to temporarily release him.

THE COURT: Can you point me to where in Dr. Giftos' affidavit it describes his respiratory condition?

MR. DE CASTRO: We don't -- it's not in his affidavit, Judge. I'm sorry. One second. My apologies. I wasn't able to print everything. I'm in a printerless spot so I'm just looking electronically at an exhibit.

Valerie, do you have it handy?

MS. GOTLIB: Yes. Exhibit K is the letter from our client's doctor and Exhibit L is the affidavit from Dr. Giftos and it is in Exhibit K that we have information specific to our client's particular respiratory issues.

34 THE COURT: One second. Bear with me, please. 1 2 MS. GOTLIB: And this was the initial submission 3 filed on March 25th, Your Honor, not the reply. 4 THE COURT: I can't find it. I don't have access. MR. DE CASTRO: Judge, I have it open. I can read 5 6 it to you, if you like. 7 THE COURT: Yes, please. 8 MR. DE CASTRO: So it's from Dr. Enrique Herrera 9 Ascencio, A-S-C-E-N-C-I-O, a translated version. It was in 10 Spanish originally. The translated version reads as follows. 11 "Through this channel, it is stated that on June 26, 12 2015, I examined Ing Genaro in the office of the undersigned 13 below for a respiratory condition characterized by cough and 14 whitish expectoration, mild respiratory distress and 15 occasional wheezing. I referred him after exposure to air 16 conditioning. Bronchodilators were prescribed. Aipatropium 17 bromide for three days, with a parenthetical that it is 18 Atrovent, and Aclidinium for six weeks as well as symptomatic 19 ibuprofen and Vartalon. 20 THE COURT: That was in 2015? 21 MR. DE CASTRO: Correct. 22 THE COURT: And was there an exacerbation or 23 recurrence of that in 2019? 24 MR. DE CASTRO: Yes, in November of 2019. 25 THE COURT: Where in the record is there an

indication of his father having the same or similar conditions?

MR. DE CASTRO: It's not in the record, Judge. I haven't been able to obtain any documentation of that. I'm just proffering it, Your Honor, that the family has informed me of that.

MR. HARRIS: And, Your Honor, this is Ryan Harris. Just to also be clear, other than this one paragraph about the condition for a few weeks in 2015, there is no documentation substantiating the claim that there was a recurrence of his condition in 2019. As far as the medical documentation is concerned, all it shows is that he had mild respiratory distress in June of 2015 and he took medication for a few weeks.

MR. DE CASTRO: I think also the CDC indicator is that it's people over 50, not 60. He is 51.

MR. HARRIS: Well, Your Honor, the defendant's own affidavit from the medical doctor indicated that it was over 60 and, again, the MDC has not made a high risk, this is not -- in the document submitted by the doctor, there's no reference that this is a chronic condition which is the real concern here. The concern is not whether in the past, years ago, you had a respiratory illness but whether you had a chronic respiratory or otherwise related condition now, not something that you had five years ago.

THE COURT: Last word, Mr. De Castro. 1 2 MR. DE CASTRO: So I wouldn't know if he's having 3 any respiratory conditions because I can't speak to my client 4 anyway. I don't even know -- no matter what we do to request it and I appreciate the BOP's issues. I don't know, I don't 5 know what, what's happening. I know he's very scared and is 6 7 very concerned that he will contract the virus and if he does, 8 it will have a very significant effect. 9 THE COURT: The application for temporary release is 10 denied absent some definitive indication that Mr. Garcia Luna 11 suffers from a chronic respiratory condition or some other 12 medical condition that places him at a higher risk for 13 complications related to COVID-19. I find that there is 14 insufficient grounds to release him temporarily. So those are my rulings. 15 Mr. De Castro, if you would like to appeal that to 16 17 Judge Cogan, you're free to do so. 18 MR. DE CASTRO: Thank you, Judge. 19 THE COURT: Is there anything else? 20 MR. HARRIS: Not from the government, Your Honor. 21 MR. DE CASTRO: No, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. 23 THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, everyone. 24 (Teleconference ended.) 25